



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR      | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.        |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 10/716,297      | 11/18/2003  | Jean-Luc Philippe Bettoli | CM1924MCC           | 6900                    |
| 27752           | 7590        | 03/31/2005                |                     | EXAMINER                |
|                 |             |                           |                     | HARDEE, JOHN R          |
|                 |             |                           | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER            |
|                 |             |                           | 1751                |                         |
|                 |             |                           |                     | DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/716,297             | BETTIOL ET AL.      |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | John R. Hardee         | 1751                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- . Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 21-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 21-35 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02222005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Groups VI and VII in the reply filed on March 25, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that separate classification does not constitute separate classification in the art; alternatively, there is no excessive burden in the search and examination of seven inventions. This is not found persuasive because separate subclassification is indeed sufficient evidence that separate searches are necessary, and the burden of searching and examining seven inventions is obvious on its face.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

No claims were withdrawn from consideration, but the claims were searched and examined only to the extent that they read on the elected inventions. The examiner recommends that the claims be amended to remove the term "polymers", as the elected classes of amines are monomeric.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has recited "...aminoalkyl piperazine derivatives of aminoalkyl piperazine...". It would appear that this should read "...aminoalkyl

piperazine, derivatives of aminoalkyl piperazine..." and the claims have been searched and examined on that basis.

***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 21-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-27 and 37-39 of copending Application No. 10/168,936, claims 1-3, 6-12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23-26 of copending US Application No. 10/911,283 and 1-11 of copending US Application No. 10/911,115. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '115 claims cleaning compositions comprising the presently claimed reaction products; the '283 claims reaction products in which the amine is a polyamine rather than a polymer, but may be either of the elected amines; and the '936 claims a composition comprising a pro-perfume, which may be an amino functional polymer as presently claimed in combination with a benefit agent, which may be a perfume as presently claimed, in close proximity. Under such circumstances, the

Art Unit: 1751

perfume and the amino functional polymer would be expected to react to some extent to form a Schiff base. Accordingly, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made to make the presently claimed reaction product, because the '115 claims compositions comprising same, the 283 claims the same reaction products as polyamines rather than as polymers, and the '936 claims compositions claiming the same starting materials, and the person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect those materials to react when in close proximity to form the presently claimed reaction products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 21-35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,451,751. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims recite a method of making the presently claimed reaction product. It would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made to make the presently claimed reaction products, because the patented claims recite a method for making them.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1751

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 21-23, 25, 26 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dybas et al., US 4,172,094. See col. 3, lines 11-14 and lines 18-19, as well as the first two entries of Table II. These disclose compounds made by forming the Schiff bases of aminoalkyl piperazines or aminoalkylated propylene-1,3-diamine with aldehydes or ketones, followed by cyanoethylation and catalytic hydrogenation to afford compounds which are disclosed at col. 7, lines 4-6 as antimicrobials. Application in water to fabric is disclosed at col. 7, lines 22+. As the compositional limitations have been met, the odor threshold limitation would appear to follow as a result of making the product as claimed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1751

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 21-26 and 28-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dybas et al., US 4,172,094. See the 102 rejection above. The reference further discloses that these compounds can be formulated with soaps or detergents for use as skin cleansers (col. 7, lines 37-38), and that additional perfumes may be added (col. 8, line 17). It is notoriously common to add softening materials to skin cleansers, and some surfactants have softening properties. Application as a spray to walls, kitchen equipment, etc. is disclosed at col. 8, lines 4+. Regarding claims 24, note that the final products in the first two entries of Table II are tetrahydrochlorides. Formulation of tetrahydrobromides or the use of larger counterions is obvious over the reference. These products would have molecular weights exceeding 600 daltons. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on all of applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a surfactant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (571) 272-1316.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1751

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John R. Hardee  
Primary Examiner  
March 28, 2005